Preserve

App. F. IX-4

1935-36
(Muzrai)

Muz File No. 207-35
Serial Nos. 1-4

Previous References

Later References

~~207~~ - 35-36.

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

Serial Nos. 4

Part B for March 1936

SUBJECT.

Question of preferring appeals in respect of legacies left by the late Sri Madapati Venkata-Iswara Rao Pantulu in favour of the Sri Veera Vaishnavas at Benares and Rameswaram

170/299

Date 16.3.36

From To Medical

Forwards the opinion of the Govt Advocate in the matter

Re: legacies left by the late Mr. Madabathi Venkateswara Rao Pantulu in favour of the Branch Srimath Mutts at Benares & Rameswaram

General and Revenue Secretariat — Misc File No. — of 193 — [App. F. III—2

Serial No.	
1	Letter no C 1137/35-36 dt 25.2.1936 from the Muzrai Commissioner requesting immediate instructions in the matter of prosecuting the appeals referred to therein about the legacies left by the late Mr Madabathi Venkateswara Rao Pantulu in favour of the Branch Srimath Mutts at Benares & Rameswaram — 1) Sri Srimath Mutt is now under Govt Management as per G.O. no 1028-130/Muzrai 174-35-2 dt 30-1-36 — Mr. V. Sitharamaiya Asst Comr. is in charge of the affairs of Sri Srimath Mutt. — It is for the benefit of the Branch Srimath Mutts at Benares & Rameswaram the late Mr. Venkateswara Rao Panthalu left by his Will dt [illegible] has given the endowment. 2 The legal opinion suggested by the M.C. as at "A" in the P.W.D. Will if appd be obtained immediately as in the last para of the P.W.D. it is stated that the time for filing an application to the High Court would expire by the end of the current month. 3 Submitted for orders — 4) Law Section may be requested to furnish opinion. Or transfer to the Advocate General 26/2/36

(* Linked File) Govt

NOTE.—Contn. Sheet.

WD 0J594—GPB—30,000—18-7-35

5) For perusal
Govt-Rep. may be consulted. hio
26/2

SPL
26/2

Forwarded w/ with Compliments
to the Govt Advocate for taking advice
Mr Venkatesalyer
26/2/36 Govt Pleader

By 26/2/36
No 957/35
By

No. Rp. 122
35-36
By 29.2.36

(Returned with compliments.)

The records are not complete and even a copy of the Power of Attorney given to the Agent is not available. It may perhaps be assumed that the Agent was empowered to have the matter settled by means of a compromise.

Regarding the annuity of Rs.425/- for issuing Sadavarth to Bairagies, the matter became final long ago as no appeal was filed in the High Court against the decree of the Subordinate Judge. There may be no use in trying to agitate this question now.

It is difficult to see without further information why the Girls' School and the National College are appealing to the Privy Council to have the compromise entered into by the Mutt Agent set aside. In the memo. furnished by Mr. Ganapathi Iyer, the statement that the

Mutt

Serial No.

Mutt threw away all expenses incurred hitherto, does not seem to be correct as according to para 3 of the Compromise petition, the Plaintiff i.e., the Mutt has to get costs incurred by it in the appeals. The records do not show under what circumstances the compromise was entered into. Mr. Subbaroya Iyer who filed the Compromise petition in the High Court may be able to give more useful information with respect to the matters now raised for consideration. Mr. Sreekanta Sastri's reply to the Muzrai Commissioner's letter may also throw some light on the matter.

11) According to the Compromise, the Mutt has relinquished a portion of the arrears due under the decree of the trial court on the contesting defendant withdrawing his appeals in regard to two of the cies in favour of the Mutt. It appears from the Judgment that representatives of most of the Charities also compromised their claims with the contesting defendant. The learned Judges of the High Court of Madras accepted the settlement after taking the opinion of the Advocate General in the matter. Under these circumstances it is difficult to say that the compromise was not in the interests of the Mutt particularly when it is remembered that the Mutt's appeal in the High Court was for obtaining larger amounts by way of arrears and interest and that the contesting defendant had also appealed against the decree in favour of the Mutt. Since the decree of the High Court was passed with the consent of parties, an appeal to the King, in Council, may not lie.

NOTE.—Contn. Sheet.

WD 03594—GPB—30,000—18-7-35

lic, though if a proper case can be made out, other remedies may be available to the Mutt, (c.f. Mulla's Code of Civil Procedure, page 324).

(2) I must, however, make it clear that I have based my opinion on the very meagre materials before me. There seems to be no time to get all the necessary information in the matter as Mr. Ganapathi Iyer says that further proceedings, if any, should be taken before the end of this month. Under these circumstances, it would be desirable to send some Officer of the Muzrai Department acquainted with the facts of the case to discuss the matter personally with Mr. Subbaroya Iyer and Mr. Ganapathi Iyer in order to see whether it would be worth-while taking up the matter to the Privy Council.

V. Meagyswami Iyer
Government Advocate.

H/27.2.36.

1/3 For perusal. We have only two days more in the month and the material available is insufficient to come to a decision

1/4 The view of the Govt. Advocate may be communicated to the Devr Court and the idea of an appeal held in abeyance till after Mr Srikanta Dass has replied. If it should later appear that an appeal is

Serial No.

desirable it may be possible to get it admitted representing that the affairs of the Instt were being just taken over owing to the illness of the Head of the Instt and that the rule of Diwan taking may not be strictly applied

Dwn
27.2.36

6210
28/2

Inst Member

Jpa 28/2

16) Dwn 2.11.2

~~We accord ... Instt ... 289 2/36 ... Instt ...~~

17) Dfn

Sec
27/2

For permt
typewriter

Dwn 29/2

Tyer

WD 0359—GPB—30,000—18-7/35

NOTE.—Contn. Sheet.

Re: Legacies left by
Madapati Venkateswara Rao
for the Sringeri mutt

Muz 3 File No. 207 of 1935. General Sec

No 1227 of 2-3-1936 from the Muzrai Commissioner furnishing him with the legal opinion expressed in respect of his letter referred to in Ref no 1

Letter no 1137 of 28/2/36 from the Muzrai Commissioner forwarding Copy of Kadur Deputy Commissioner's letter No S 3076 of 27-2-1936 together with additional records.

Submitted in Continuation of the previous file.

2) Submitted M.U. 28/2 Noted 28/2 first member).

3) Returned with orders. Submitted - S.R.R. 29/2

Letter no C 1137/35-36 of 29.2.1936 from the Muzrai Commissioner forwarding Copy of letter received from Gurusewa Pravina N. Sitharama Sastri furnishing information on the points raised by the Muzrai Commissioner.

Opinion of the Govt Advocate in paras 8-12 supra has been communicated to the M.C. It is submitted for orders if the file may be returned to G.A. again with additional

Re: Rate the Mahārājpati Venkateswara Rao Pantulu's legacies in favour of Rao Sahib Mutt.

General and Revenue Secretariat — File No. 207 of 1935. b — [App. F. III—2

Serial No.	
	records & information received to date from the Collector
	GS 2.3.36
	25 This may be allowed. 2/3/36
	Gen. Secy. Orders for perusal. The papers will be sent to the Govt. Advocate again. 3/3 3/3
	1st Member 27 3/3 3/3 3/3
21-0-No 45/35-36 Dated 4/3/36 Two 778/35-36 dt 5.3.36	Forwarded with Compliments to the Government Advocate for favour of opinion. By order 4/3/36 for General Secretary
Ro No. 130/35-36 dt 6.3.36	Returned with compliments. I have very little to add to my previous note. Mr. Srikanta Sastri's letter shows that the settlement was effected after taking competent legal advice and in

GENERAL SECRETARIAT 1 MAR 1936 24

GENERAL SECRETARIAT 3 MAR 1936 6307

GENERAL SECRETARIAT 9 MAR 1936

Notes—Contn. Sheet.

WD 03694—GPB—30,000—18-7-35

File No. 20 for Sri Srinivasa Iyengar of 19 General and Secretarial

in consultation with others interested in the affai s of the Mutt. As I have mentioned already, most of the Charities compromised the case and the High Cou t of Madras accepted the settlement only after taking the opinion of the Advocate-General as representing the public. With due respect to Mr. P. R. Ganapat i Iyer, I think under the above circumstances, that - there would be no use in filing an appeal to the - Privy Council.

2) If the Girls' School and the National College appeal to the Privy Council impeaching the conduct o the Mutt's former Agent and really succeed in havin the compromise set aside, the Mutt will have the benefit of it without further trouble and expense. - Even so, an appeal by the Mutt would be unnecessary.

V. Rangaswami Iyer
Government Advocate.

H/6.3.1936.

For perusal with reference to para 7 above.

The Govt. Adv.'s view may be accepted and the Mr. informed.

10/3

8/10/3

First Member

10/3 10/3

8/11/3

OFFICE OF THE FIRST MEMBER OF COUNCIL
10 MAR. 1936
No. 6421

Bangalore, 4th March 1936



FROM K. V. ANANTARAMAN, Esq., B.A.,
~~N. MADHAVA RAU, Esq., B.A., B.L.,~~
Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore,
Bangalore.



To Venkatesa Iyengar, Esq., B.A.,
Secretary to the Government of His Highness
the Maharaja of Mysore,
General ..... *Department*

1/573

SIR,

Legacies bequeathed by the late Mr. Madabati Venkateswara Rao Pantulu.

With reference to your letter No.1227/ Muz.207-35-2 dated 2-3-1936 re. the above, I have the honour to state that the records said to have been sent along with the letter have not received, and to request that the same may kindly be sent early.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,
M. N. Anantharaman
For Muzrai Commissioner.
(Absent from Headquarters.)

Serial No.

3 4) The connected file including the records received with the M-C's letter of 25/2/36 has been sent to the Govt Advocate for opinion ~~Instructions~~. If asked, the M-C. will be told that the records will be returned on their return from the G.A.

G.S. 5/3

3/5

36) Yes 6/3

WD 03594—GPB—30,000—18-7-35

19)

965

File No. of 193 General and Se

37) D/h. Subd —
Gv
10/3/36 11/3

38) The records have been sent back for the G.A. proceedings passed also. Both the revised drafts may once for all minutes and returned
12/3

Letter no C 1137/35-26 dy 11.3.36 from the Mazrai Commissioner furnishing information called for and requesting orders re: the legacies bequeathed by the late Mrs Madapati Venkateswara Rao Pantalu —

39) orders given Asst Sec on the R.u-D: —
= The orders passed may be communicated to the M.C. early".

Other land transactions —

Gv
draft

Serial No.



4 No 1299 S 16.3.1936 to the Secretariat Commissioner stating that Government accepts the views of the Government Advocate in the matter of the proposed appeal.

WD 03594—GPB—30,000—13-7-35

File No. of 193 General Secr

Mis 20735-1

No. ...11.37... 35 6

Enc. 1 & file

OFFICE OF THE MUZRAI COMMISSIONER
IN MYSORE,

Bangalore, 24th February 1936

25-

GENL & MIS BRANCH
26 FEB. 1936

REV. SECTT.
C. 2 923
MUZRAI BR.

FROM

K. V. ANANTARAMAN, ESQ., B.A.,
Muzrai Commissioner for Mysore,

To

I. Venkatesa Iyengar, Esq., I.A.S.,
Secretary to the Government of His Highness
the Maharaja of Mysore,
General *Department.*

GENERAL
25 FEB. 1936

Mr. Lakshmanna
Sir,

Question of preferring appeals in respect of legacies left by the late Rao Bahadur Venkatesvara Rao Pantulu in favour of the branch Sri Mutts at Benares and Rameswaram.

In forwarding herewith copy of letter No. S.3076/35-36 dated 22nd February 1936 to ether with its enclosures in original received from the Deputy Commissioner, [illegible] District, on the above subject, I have the honor to state that the Deputy Commissioner suggests that the Government Advocate may be consulted whether it would be practicable to the Mutt to get the compromise entered into by Mr. [illegible] Srikanta Sastry as General Power-of-Attorney holder on behalf of the Mutt cancelled before filing an appeal to the Privy Council but with the necessary sanction of the High Court and Government but could be said to be in the Court in respect of the amount of Rs.4a5, only the portion ended from the suit pursuant to Bala [illegible] before [illegible] allowed by the Subordinate Judge.

I have to observe [illegible] the latter question it is doubtful whether there is not barred by limitation [illegible] the fact that an appeal had been preferred to the High Court in respect of the other items but not in respect of [illegible] and that the compromise question also, it is [illegible] available [illegible] entered into the compromise. I am [illegible] about the circumstances, under which [illegible]

I have to request that [illegible]

may kindly be obtained in respect of preferring these two appeals and the Government Advocate instructed to get into touch with Mr. P. S. Sanapathi Iyer, Advocate, Madras, for obtaining further information, if necessary.

As it is reported that the period for filing an application to the High Court would expire by the end of the current month, I solicit the favour of immediate instructions in the matter.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

K. Ananthanarayana 24.2.36

Muzrai Commissioner.

IMMEDIATE

Letter No.S.3076/35-36 dated 22-2-36 from the Deputy Commissioner, Kadur District to the Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore.

Legacies left by the late Mr. Madapati Venkateswara Rao Pantulu in favour of the branch Sringeri Mathas at Benares and at Rameswaram.

I have the honor to forward herewith a copy of letter No.2735-B dated 13-2-36 from the Officer-in-charge, Sringeri Jahagir with its enclosures noted in the margin on the above subject and to state as follows:

The late Mr. Madapati Venkateswara Rao Pantulu bequeathed certain legacies in favour of the Sringeri branch Mathas at Benares and Rameswaram and many other charities. As per legacies provided for in the testator's will, the Mutt was entitled to get the amounts noted below:-

(a) For expenses in connection with the Pooja of Sri Jagadguru &c. in the Sringeri Mutt, Visheshwara Ghat, Benares Rs 360 per year

(b) For a Mutt building at Rameswaram and for consecrating the Idol of Sri Jagadguru Rs 3,500 or 4,500 and for giving Sadavruthu to Sannyasis at Rameswaram and Pooja to the Guru Idols Rs 350 a year.

(c) For feeding Sanyasis at Branch Mutt, Visheshwaraghat, Benares Rs 1,200 a year.

On a suit filed by Mr. M. Chikanna Sastri, the Mutt Agent, the Subordinate Judge at Pasulipata allowed items (a) and (c) in full and in respect of (b) having allowed the lumpsum for the Mutt building, disallowed half of the annuity of Rs 350 in his finding and decree as Sadavruthu having had been stopped in the lifetime of the testator.

Some of the legatees of other Charities preferred appeals in the High Court, Madras, and their claims under the will are fully pending in the High Court. I have reason to believe that if the amount is preferred on appeal in the High Court in spite of the disallowance the Mutt would have obtained the full benefit. According to the decree of the lower court, the Mutt was entitled to get nearly Rs 9,000 which was contested by Mr. Venkatapathi Iyer, Advocate, Madras. If the appeal preferred and proved successful, the Mutt would have received Rs 9,000. In addition to this, the Agent chose to file a compromise petition in the High Court

...ting from the said purcha...er of certain proper...
...sum of R 7,052-4-0 payable in two equal annual instalments. The ...
...ments seems to be clearly to adversely affect the interest of ...
...lt seriously and I consider that the act of the Agent is not in order ...
The reason quoted in the compromise petition is to avoid anxiety, trouble ...pense and uncertainty in further carrying on the litigation.

...o that the management has been assumed by Government, the bonafides ...f the compromise effected have to be examined and we have to take all ...ossible steps to secure to the estate whatever is legally due to it.

...request, you therefore to consult the Government Advocate whether it ...s practicable for the estate to get the compromise cancelled by preferring an ...eal to Privy Council within the necessary extension of the High Court and ...peal to the High Court in respect of the annuity of R 425 which has been dismissed by the subordinate Judge in the suit as a case.

...t is stated that the time for such application expires by the end of ...is month, this may be kindly treated as immediate. If necessary, a ...el may be sent to the Advocate stating as to get the necessary copies of ...Judgments etc., if any. I also request the Officer-in-charge to send any other references which may be available in the Estate Office and on his reply ...further instruction will be sent.

COPY"

M. N. Ramachandra
24.2.36

for Rural Commissioner.

GOVERNMENT OF HIS HIGHNESS THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE

General and Revenue Secretariat

Dated, Bangalore, 2nd March *1936*

No. (22) / Muz 207-35-2
Bangalore

From

The *General Secretary to the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore*

To

The Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore,
Bangalore.

Sir,

Subject: Legacies bequeathed by the late Mr.Madapati Venkateswara Rao Pantalu.

...

With reference to your letter No.1137 dated 25th February 1936 on the above subject, I am directed to forward herewith for information, copy of the opinion dated 27th February 1936 given by the Government Advocate in the matter and to state that the idea of an appeal may be held in abeyance till after Mr. Srikanta Sastri has replied. I am to add further that if it should later appear that an appeal is desirable, it may be possible to get it admitted representing that the affairs of ~~the~~ Sri Mutt were being just taken over owing to the illness of the Head of the Mutt and that the rule of limitation may not be strictly applied.

The record~~s~~ received with your letter under advertence ~~are~~ is herewith returned.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,

for General Secretary to Govt.

R.

F G—1]

BJECT .....

.....

.....

Section May

File No. 207-38

Serial No. 2

Diary No. of letter replied to .....

No 1229 enclosure

To

The D.C

Subject:— Legacies bequeathed by the late Rao Madhavi Venkateswara Rao Pantulu Garu,

With reference to your letter Nos 1137 & 25/2/36 ~~& 287/2/36~~ on the above subject, I am directed to forward herewith ~~this~~ information duly as the opinion by 27-2-36 given by the G.A. in the matter and to state that the idea of an appeal may be left in abeyance

Yetlam

General and Revenue Secretariat

( )

the 193

Date of issue 2-3-36

Signed by M V B Reddi

List of enclosures .....

(1 paper + 12 pages)

Copied by .....

Examined by .....

WD 71—GPBM—40,000—20-7 31

-That if it

later appears that an

appeal is desirable it may

be convenient to get it admitted

de presenting that the affairs

of the Trust were being

just taken over owing to

The illness of the Head of the Trust

& that the rule of limitation

may not be strictly applied.

The Records received with

the letter under acknowledgement

this receipt acknowledged.

Yours etc

29/2

29/2

for Secretary

Enc 1&1 copy + copy
power of Attorney + 3 files

IN MYSORE,

Dated, Bangalore, 28th February ....., 1936

FROM K. V. ANANTARAMAN, Esq., B.A.,
~~N. MADHAVA RAO, Esq., B.A., B.L.,~~
Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore.

6219
-29/2

To

M. Venkatesa Iyengar, Esq., B.A.,
Secretary to the Government of His Highness
the Maharaja of Mysore,
.....General.....*Department.*

SIR,

Legacies bequeathed by the late Dr. Madapati Venkateswara Rao Pantulu.

— —

No 923 sent to 1st member -2/2

In continuation of this office letter No.C.1137/35-36 dated 25th February 1936 on the above subject, I have the honor to forward herewith a copy of Kadur District Deputy Commissioner's letter No.3.3076/35-36 dated 27th February 1936 together with its enclosures in original and three connected files of records received therewith and to request immediate instructions as already requested.

I have the honor to be,

SIR,

Your most obedient servant,

K Chandrasekhara
Muzrai Commissioner.

MM

Subd in continuation of the previous file -/

Member

Secy to Govt 28/2
Secy to Govt 2/2
Secy to Govt 29/2
Secy to Govt 29/2
Secy to Govt 29/2

Legacies bequeathed by the late Mr. Ladapati Venkateswara Rao Pantulu.

In continuation of this office letter No.B.3076/35-36 dated 17-2-36 on the above subject, I have the honor to forward herewith a copy of letter No.B/35-36 dated 24-2-36 with its enclosure together with the connected 5 files of records received to-day from the Officer-in-charge of Sringeri Mutt.

2. I request you will be so good as to send them to the Government Advocate for opinion and to obtain the sanction of Government for taking such measures as may be deemed necessary in the interests of the Mutt.

"COPY"

for Huzur Commissioner.

IN

Dated, Bangalore,...29th February...1936.

757

FROM K.V. Anantaraman Esq., B.A.,
Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore.

To

M. Venkatesa Iyengar Esq.,...M.A.,
General *Secretary to the Government of His Highness*
the Maharaja of Mysore,
.....*Department.*

GENERAL SECRETARIAT
1 - MAR 1936

SIR,

In continuation of my letter No. C.1137/35-36 of yesterday's date, forwarding to you the records relating to certain legacies left by the late Mr. Venkateswara Rao Pantulu to the Sringeri Mutt, I have the honor to forward herewith a copy of the letter received from Guruseva Pravina N. Srikanta Sastry, in reply to an enquiry made by me as to the circumstances in which a compromise petition was presented to the High Court of Madras.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

K V Anantaraman

Muzrai Commissioner.

M.B.R.

Letter dated 27th February 1936 from
Guruseva Pravina N. Srikanta Sastry, Kallahalli, Nanjangud Post,
to the Revenue and Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore.

I acknowledge receipt of your D.O. letter No.1137, 35-36 dated 24-2-1936.

The Administration suit in connection with the legacies of late Mr. Venkateswara Rao Panthulu was filed by the Sringeri Mutt in the Subordinate Judge's Court, Masulipatam, on 19-9-1921. The Final Decree in the suit was passed on 7-3-1925.

An appeal was preferred to the Madras High Court against one or two findings of the lower Court, being pressed by our Consels to do so. The appeal was filed on 13-7-1925, and it did not come up for arguments till October 1934. On being informed that the case would be heard in November 1934, I went to Madras where the defendant sought for a compromise. After consulting some of the best Lawyers at Madras and other persons who are highly attached to the Mutt, it was considered desirable to arrive at a compromise and avoid further litigation, anxiety and expenses. By that time, the Mutt had already spent Rs 4000/- for the case.

According to late Mr. Venkateswara Rao Panthulu's will, the Charities that had to be conducted at the Benares Branch of the Sringeri Mutt were two:- (1) Feeding Sanyasis, and (2) the daily worship of the idols of Gowrishankera and other deities installed by the testator there. Of these, the Mutt had not spent a pie for Sanyasi-feeding and so, that item of charity had not been conducted at all. Regarding the 2nd item, from the date of filing the suit in the original court, the Mutt advanced amounts and conducted this charity The compromise arrived at, subject to the approval of the High Court, was as

follows.- the amount spent from the Mutt for the 2nd item should be paid in full for all the 14 years; and for the 1st item and arrears for 4 years, the amount deposited in Court be received in satisfaction of the decree.

In the will referred to, it is nowhere mentioned that any charities should be conducted in the Sringeri Mutt at Rameswaram. It is only mentioned that the testator or his representatives should purchase a site at Rameswaram, should put up a building at a cost of Rs 1500 to 2000/-; and an idol of Sri Shankaracharya, which had been got prepared by the testator, should be installed there and that an annual expenditure of Rs 850/- be incurred for the worship of the idol as well as for giving sadavarth to 12 Bairagis. It was found doubtful if this charity would come under the management of the Sringeri Mutt. Under the compromise effected, the defendant consented to this charity being conducted by the Sringeri Mutt at Rameswaram and to pay a sum of Rs 425/- a year for worship of the idol of Sri Shankar.

The Razinama petition was filed in the High Court either in the month of December 1934 or January 1935.

The entire records connected with the case which were with me were sent to the Agent at Sringeri on 23-1-1936 and a reply was been received from the latter. I have not got any more papers relating to this case.

In this connection, I may bring an important matter to your notice. As per the Razinama decree, I had received from the defendant, for expenses for one year, i.e., from July 1935 to the end of June 1936, a sum of Rs 1200 plus 360 for the Benares Mutt, and Rs 420/- for the Rameswaram Mutt. I have sent these amounts to the local agents in those places. Out of Rs 1560/- received for the Benares Mutt, Rs 600 and odd have been spent for effecting repairs in that Mutt to provide accommodation for feeding of Sanyasis. Accounts for the same have been received. The Manager at Benares has only Rs 900/-

and odd for feeding of sanyasis and for worship of the deity there. The feeding is being conducted since 7th May 1935. The amount for 1936 will be received only by the end of June this year. Hence the Mutt has to advance money required till then and adjust it from the deposit to be drawn from Court If no amount is sent for expenses in this connection, the charity that is being conducted may stop and this may be open to objection

---

" C o p y "

K. Ramachandra Rao

Muzrai Commissioner.

C No. 1227
35-6

OFFICE OF THE MUZRAI COMMISSIONER,
IN MYSORE,

Dated, Bangalore, ..9th March..... 1936.

FROM K. V. ANANTARAMAN, Esq., B.A.,
~~N. MADHAVA RAO, Esq., B.A., B.L.,~~
Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore.

To

M....Venkatesa..Iyengar,...Esq.,...M.A.,
Secretary to the Government of His Highness
the Maharaja of Mysore,
..... General..... .....*Department.*

GENERAL SECRETARIAT
12 MAR 1936

SIR,

Legacies bequeathed by the late
Mr. Madapati Venkateswara Rao Pantulu.

With reference to your letter No.1227/Muz.207-35-2 dated 2nd March 1936 stating, among other matters, that the idea of an appeal re. the above may be held in abeyance till after Mr. Srikanta Sastry has replied, I have the honor to state that a copy of Mr. Srikanta Sastry's letter was sent to you with this office letter dated 29th February 1936. A copy of the Special Power given to Mr. Srikanta Sastry by His Holiness the Swamigalu and said to be not available by the Government Advocate will be found in the records sent with this office letter of the 28th ultimo. I solicit the favour of further orders, if any, in the matter.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

K V Ananthraman

Muzrai Commissioner.

Appendix F

SUBJECT .....

.....

.....

2 Cheques

Section Mag

File No. 807-38

Serial No. 4

Diary No. of letter replied to .....

No. 1297 Cuel Records

To

The M.C.

Sir

With reference to your letters Nos 1137 & 28/2/36, & 29/2/36, & 6.3.36 & 11.3.36 re: legacies bequeathed by the late Mr Pydah Venkatasami Rao Pantulu, I am directed to forward herewith Copy of the G.A.S opinion 4/6/2/36 on the subject & to state that Government accept the G.A.S view. that Government Consider that an Appeal by Sri Singam Nuka Raju & Co. under section 18 of the Court Fees Act, should be preferred by the Collector.

Date of issue 16-3-36

Signed by for R. Reddi Rao

Paras 29 to 30 of the G.A.S opinion

List of enclosures .....

Copied by 16/3

Examined by.....

2/14/13
For Course

GP
M 1/3
12/13
14/13

ERNMENT OF HIS HIGHNESS THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE 27

General and Revenue Secretariat

Dated, Bangalore, 16th March 1936.

No. 1299/Mug 207-35-4

From

The *Secretary to the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore.*
General Department, Bangalore.

To

The Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore,

Bangalore.

Sir,

With reference to your letters Nos.1137, dated 28th February 1936, 29th Feoruary 1936, 4th March 1936 and 11th March 1936 regarding legacies bequeathed by the late Mr.Madapati Venkateswara Rao antalu, I am directed to forward herewith copy of the Government Advocate's opinion dated 6th March 1936 on the subject, and to state that Government accept the Government Advocate's view. The entire records received from you on the subject are herewith returned.

I have the honour to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

General Secretary to Government.

psk-3